



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,565	07/30/2003	Min-Ho Seo	P24001	6472
7055 7590 02/21/2007 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			EXAMINER SCHLIE, PAUL W	
			ART UNIT 2186	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com  
pto@gbpatent.com

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
10/629,565	SEO ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Paul W. Schlie	2186	

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) *Joshua M. Povsner (Applicant's Representative).*

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Time:

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

*all*

Prior art documents discussed:

*see below*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

### Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: reviewed post allowance submitted IDS references, and agreed that although a multi-media device as disclosed is well known in general, no evidence of such a device utilizing a remote storage device of sufficient capacity to credibly store multi-media data whose power is conditionally sourced from said multi-media device yet accessed wirelessly was known of by either; and thereby considered non-obvious in its specific claimed combination..